₹ 124.70 ಲಕ್ಷಗಳ ವೆಚ್ಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿಯಾಗಿ 08 ವಾಸದ ಕೊಠಡಿಗಳು, 12 ಶೌಚಾಲಯಗಳು, 12 ಸ್ನಾನಗೃಹಗಳ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಹಾಗೂ ಇನ್ನಿತರೆ ದುರಸ್ತಿ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

Karnataka Evaluation Authority ಬಗ್ಗೆ

2662 (3269); ಡಾ॥ ಅಜಯ್ ಸಿಂಗ್ (ಜೇವರ್ಗಿ)

ಅ) ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮೌಲ್ಯಮಾಪನ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರ ಯಾವ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ ಅಸ್ಥಿತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ?

ಆ) ಇದರ ಕಾರ್ಯ ವಿಧಾನವೇನು; ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮೌಲ್ಯಮಾಪನಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಗುಲಿದ ವೆಚ್ಚವೆಷ್ಟು; ಯಾವ ಎಜನ್ಸಿಗೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗಲಿದೆ ವರದಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ನೀಡಿದ ಸಮಯವೆಷ್ಟು ಹಾಗೂ ವಿಳಂಬವಾಗಿ ವರದಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದವರ ವಿವರ ನೀಡುವುದು.

ಇ) ಈ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರೆ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಭರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿದ ಮಾನದಂಡಗಳೇನು;

ಈ) ಮೌಲ್ಯಮಾಪನ ವರದಿ ಬಂದ ನಂತರ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸು ಅಥವಾ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯಾವ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಆರ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ (ಮಾನ್ಯ ಯೋಜನೆ ಸಾಂಖ್ಯಿಕ, ಮಾಹಿತಿ ತಂತ್ರಜ್ಞಾನ, ಜೈವಿಕ ತಂತ್ರಜ್ಞಾನ ಹಾಗೂ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನ ಮತ್ತು ತಂತ್ರಜ್ಞಾನ ಸಚಿವರು)

ಅ) ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮೌಲ್ಯಮಾಪನ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರವು ದಿನಾಂಕ: 05.09.2011 ರಂದು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆದೇಶದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಪಿಡಿ/20/ಇವಿಎನ್/2011 ರಂದು ಅಸ್ಥಿತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

ಆ) ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮೌಲ್ಯಮಾಪನ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯ ವಿಧಾನ, ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ ಜವಬ್ದಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆದೇಶ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಪಿಡಿ/8/ಇವಿಎನ್/(2)/2011, ದಿನಾಂಕ: 11.07.2011ರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು **ಅನುಬಂಧ–1**ರಲ್ಲಿ ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ 51 ಅಧ್ಯಯನಗಳನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಧ್ಯಯನಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬಯಸಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು **ಅನುಬಂಧ–2ಎ ಮತ್ತು 2ಬಿ** ರಲ್ಲಿ ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇ) ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮೌಲ್ಯಮಾಪನ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮೌಲ್ಯಮಾಪನಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಆಡಳಿತಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಹುದ್ದೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ನಿಯೋಜನೆ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಭರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಂಜೂರಾದ ಇತರ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊರಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ/ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ ಆಧಾರದ್ದ ಮೇಲೆ ನೇಮಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ) ಮೌಲ್ಯಮಾಪನ ಅಧ್ಯಯನದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ/ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ.

PLANNING, PROGRAMME MONITORING AND STATISTICS SECRETARIAT

Sub : Sanction of New Plan Scheme Viz Karnataka Evaluation Policy and Karnataka Evaluation Authority-Regarding

Read : 1) G.O. No. IFS 42 EVF (1) 1999, Bangalore dated 17th Nov 2000

2) Circular No. PD 41 EVF(1) 2003, Bangalore dated 5th June 2003

3) D.O. Ltr No. M-13048/12(KT)2010-SP (South)/DCH/11CD 83 receipt from Montek Singh Ahluwalia, Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission GOI.

4) Proceedings of the meeting held on 03.12.2010 under the Chairmanship of Chief Secretary to Government, GOK – regarding Karnataka Evaluation Policy.

Preamble:

Karnataka Government was one of the first in the Nation to evolve a policy on evaluation as early as the year 2000. In the Government Order read at I above, the State Government had issued Evaluation Policy which indicated that all the schemes with a budget outlay of more than Rs. One crore should be evaluated by an external agency at least once during the plan period. Upto 1% of the project (scheme) cost with an upper ceiling of Rs 5.00 lakhs was earmarked for evaluation. Further, it was stipulated that if any scheme/programme had to be taken forward beyond a plan period, it should have justified itself through an evaluation. The policy also envisaged that the outcomes of the evaluation should have been used for improving programme design and delivery.

2. However, it was soon discovered that to carry out an evaluation of every programme by the Government was not an easy task as there had been far too many programmes with an outlay of Rs. One Crore or more even within each department or wing of the Government. Consequently a change was introduced in the Evaluation Policy in the Circular read at 2 above whereby it was envisaged that each line department would select at least one key plan or non-plan scheme or programme every year for evaluation through an independent agency.

3. The responsibility of evaluation policy implementation was vested with two committees: the respective Departmental co-ordination Committee; and the State Evaluation Coordination Committee chaired by the Additional Chief Secretary. A recent review of the experience of implementing the Evaluation Policy and a workshop conducted by the Planning Department to recognize the challenges ahead revealed that there were quite a few shortcomings in the implementation. They are as follows:

(i) Absence of well formulated programmes with clear verifiable outcomes and measured baseline or benchmarks against which evaluation could have been objectively carried out.

(ii) Imperfection in the supporting institutional structure created in the Planning department and staffing it with personnel without adequate specialized technical competencies as well as the absence of an enabling environment to handle capacity building, advisory service, supervision, coordination and handholding for effective evaluation.

(iii) Uninspiring quality of evaluation reports due to both capacities of the various external agencies taking up evaluation as well as capacity and inclination of various Government departments to effectively monitor and facilitate meaningful evaluation.

(iv) Absence of accountability mechanism, lack of involvement by stakeholders and predominance of official presence in the evaluation process, reducing rigor of evaluation and prevent the creation of an independent stakeholders pressure.

(v) Evaluation process had inherent conflict of interest as the departments being evaluated were the paymaster of the outsourced evaluation agency. The arrangement between Government and evaluator tended to be that of Principal and Agent without independence

(vi) Absence of well thought out control mechanism both for the programme implementation and for programme evaluation, nor was there a procedure for proper dissemination of the findings. The result was that both transparency and quality of the evaluation reports suffered

(vii) The Policy has not infused any incentives/penalties for the line departments for not seeking evaluation inputs on an ongoing basis and in a transperent manner. Nor had there been a properly established mechanism for incorporating the feedback from evaluation addressing the policy-makers, operational staff and other stakeholders.

(viii) Capacity limitations of the human resources and financial caps (e.g. 1 per cent of the programme outlay) to assess the evaluation designs submitted by the research agencies, imperfect vendor selection and out sourcing evaluation leading to improper (if not sub-standard) evaluation studies. In turn, such evaluations lead also many departments to take the evaluation reports in a routine and monotonous manner than using the reports for improving the policy design, better target identification etc.

(ix) Evaluations are undertaken with very little time prior to the preparation of programmes and financial planning each year Consequently the evaluations fail to inform the departmental policy making during the subsequent years.

(x) Most evaluations have not been meaningfully used for mid-course correction or reformulation for any of the schemes

4. In the circumstances explained above and in order to supervise, facilitate, build capacity and handhold the departments for effective evaluation and its use for effective planning, monitoring and fine-tuning the policies, programmes and schemes for result oriented and outcome based implementation Planning Department has now proposed to establish Karnataka Evaluation Authority in the State. This proposal was considered in a meeting taken by Chief Secretary on December 3rd, 2010, and a decision was taken that Planning Department to move a detailed proposal in this regard, vide proceedings read at (4) above

5. Also Planning Commission - GOI with the approval of the Central Cabinet envisaged establishment of Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) to undertake impartial and objective assessment of the various public programmes and improve the effectiveness of public interventions. Karnataka will be the first state to set up a Karnataka Evaluation Authority which is analogous to that of Independent Evaluation office of Government of India.

6. The Honourable Chief Minister has felt the need for an independent Evaluation unit in his 2011-12 Budget speech (Para 236). Further a recent letter read at (3) from Shri Montek Singh Ahluwalia, Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission GOI addressed to Honourable Chief Minister, GOK dated January 22, 2011 has appreciated the strategy of the state for constituting Karnataka Evaluation Authority for outcomes based implementation of the programmes across all departments

7. The evaluation policy vis-à-vis setting up of Karnataka Evaluation Authority proposed by Planning Department envisages Key policy parameters of evaluation such as Principles and Objectives, policy framework & applicability of evaluation of programmes/schemes and evaluation responsibilities. Besides it proposes to set up an institutional model of Karnataka Evaluation Authority as a society to be registered under Karnataka Societies Registration Act 1960, to carry out Evaluation of programmes and schemes.

8. The above proposal has been examined by the Finance Department and while endorsing the need for evaluation, however, FD opined in favour of strengthening of existing evaluation Division without setting up a society. Also, it has suggested to have scale less posts in respect of 6 technical posts of programme division. In response to these observations Planning Department justified that there is a strong case and requirement for establishing Karnataka Evaluation Authority as society in view that Present evaluation directorate within the Secretariat set up is unable to function properly as the decision making takes long as for any small requirement the file have to move from Planning to DPAR to Finance,. Evaluation requires quick, timely and frequent decisions and it needs more flexible decision making process. Further PD agreed to the observation of FD that the six technical posts may be made scale less with the proposed pay scale prescribed as only indicative for equivalence.

9. The Cabinet has accorded its approval in Toto on 23.06.2011 vide case No. C/264/2011 for the new scheme called Karnataka State Evaluation Policy and Karnataka Evaluation Authority as proposed by Planning Department. Hence the following order

Government Order No. PDR/EVH (2)/2011, Bangalore, Dated 11-07-2011

In the circumstances explained in the Preamble, Government are pleased to sanction the New Scheme called "Karnataka State Evaluation Policy and Karnataka Evaluation Authority" with effect from 2011-12 with the following features:

The key policy parameters of Evaluation are as follows:

1. Evaluation Vision

Aims of Evaluation shall be keeping in place a transparent, effective and efficient practice of evaluation of its development policies and programmes. The Government recognizes the need for an effective use of credible evaluation as a tool to benchmark the state of affairs, refine its public policies, and designing programmes and schemes with prudent and optimal use of resources for maximizing the intended and measurable outcomes and citizen satisfaction.

2. Evaluation Mission

The following are the principles and objectives of Evaluation:

i. Prescribing standards of policy and programme formulation, monitoring, evaluation and refinement.

ii. Institutionalising enabled machinery backed by adequate financial resources and informed procedures to facilitate, supervise and enforce timely, useful and accountable evaluation.

iii. Enhanced technical capacities within the departments of the Government and by the independent evaluation agencies to undertake and effectively utilize evaluation outputs for informed decision-making

iv. Enhanced Stakeholders' satisfaction through participation, transparency and accountability.

3. Evaluation Policy Framework and Applicability:

i. Government is pleased to accord sanction for a framework for Evaluation of Government Policies, programmes in Karnataka whereby the policy context envisages for supporting capacity building, facilitation, conduct, outsourcing, responsibility matrix of various stake holders and other relevant attributes, procedures and processes essential for effective and timely evaluation and its feedback utilization for quality outcomes.

ii. This policy framework is applicable to all entities in the Karnataka Government including Urban and Rural local bodies, Government departments, Public undertakings, Boards etc. It envisages to constantly learn from experience and discussion of its work by involving experts in the fields of development, evaluation, policy studies, administrators and the general public.

iii. The policy envisages distinctly two broad types of Evaluation they are as follows:

a. External Evaluation:

All evaluation initiated by the Karnataka Evaluation Authority and paid by its own fund shall be referred as an external evaluation. The schemes which is earmarked by the authority for evaluation shall not be taken up by the line department for evaluation. Line department and its officers and implementing agencies will be duty bound to furnish all required information in time and extend all required help to the KEA for the success of the evaluation. In a year KEA may take up 20-30 evaluations which are vital for the key policy and programme refinement and assessment.

b. Internal Evaluation:

Any evaluation taken up by the line departments from their own resources shall be referred as an internal evaluation. As there is a conflict of interest in such cases the same needs to be managed, utilized and interpreted with caution. It shall be mandatory for all the line departments to take advice from the KEA on TOR, data collection tool, methodology-vendor/outsourcing agency selection and all other technical matters pertaining to the internal evaluation and follow the rules, procedures etc, prescribed by the authority. The department may earmark 1% of the plan fund for such evaluations. In a year all the departments together may take up 40-60 such evaluations. KEA will monitor the progress of the such evaluation and will receive and safe upkeep in archives all TORs, data tools, soft copy of the data collected and reports etc., for future use.

In cases of certain key evaluations of prime importance, like the one mandated in an externally aided or Centrally Sponsored Programme, the concerned department may arrive at the likely cost of such evaluation and by mutual consent entrust such evaluations to the KEA and deposit the required amount with the KEA for taking up such evaluation. Empowered committee may entrust any internal evaluation at any stage to the KEA.

4. Evaluation of Programmes/Schemes:

i. In pursuance of the aforesaid objectives every Government programme both Plan the Non-Plan category shall be evaluated in a Five Year Plan period at least once. Based on such an evaluation giving proper justification for the continuation of extension, plan programme shall be continued beyond the orginal plan period.

ii. As far as possible, small programmes/schemes shall be merged into larger generic schemes/programmes which are well formulated as per prescribed standards and in no case a department should have more than 7 to 10 such generic programmes so that they are better implemented and monitored to achieve the desired outcomes.

5. Evaluation Responsibilities

It shall be the responsibility of the Principal Secretary/Secretary of the Government Department concerned to draw up a five-year calendar of the evaluation programmes of the various Departments, Boards and Units etc., coming under her/his control. The calendar shall be in a prescribed format. One Senior Officer of the department shall be made the nodal officer for facilitating and following up of each such evaluation thus undertaken. An Officer shall not be given the concurrent responsibility of more than two programmes (Schemes). The Secretary of the department shall facilitate one or two key evaluation. Commissioner, Director, Additional or Joint heads should be assigned two programmes each. In future facilitation of evaluation work should compulsorily be taken as one of the important item of work enumerated in the Annual Appraisal Report of the Senior Officers and quality of evaluation and utilization of its feed back in programme design and implementation shall be used for their annual appraisal.

4. The Institutional Model of Establishment of Karnataka Evaluation Authority (KEA):

   i. The Government accorded sanction to set up KEA as a society and to register under the Karnataka Societies Registration Act 1960, which will be the focal point for Evaluation of Programmes.

   ii. The management of the affairs of the authority shall be vested with the General Body under the Chairmanship of Chief Secretary to Government. Executive committee and Technical committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Planning Department and Chief Evaluation officer shall be the Member-Secretary of the Authority as enshrined in the Memorandum of Association/Rules to be framed for the purpose. The Authority shall have representation from Public Administration, Management, Academics, Civil Society, Media etc.,

   iii. The Planning Department is authorized to formulate necessary Memorandum of Association (MOA) and Rules for setting up of KEA and to register as Society.

   iv. Activities/Functions of KEA:

      a. The KEA shall be primarily responsible to supervise, facilitate, build capacity and handhold the departments for effective Planning, Monitoring and fine tuning the policies, programmes, and schemes for result oriented and outcome based implementation.

      b. The Authority may undertake or commission training, consultancy, advocacy activity to further goals of effective and meaningful scheme formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation.

      c. Authority shall keep record of all the TORs, data collection tools, evaluation reports in their data base and follow-up utilization of evaluation outputs.

      d. KEA shall take a target to conduct at least 20 to 30 very important evaluations every year.

   v. Selection of Outsourcing Agency:

KEA shall adopt well laid out procedure for both tendering and selecting appropriate agency and empanelling them for evaluation where need be two part tendering process may be adopted.

a. It is crucial to establish concrete criteria on which to assess each applicant. A scoring or rating scale will be developed to establish the basis on which the proposals will be assessed. One option is to assign "each criterion with a numerical value reflecting its relative importance in comparison with other criteria." As noted in the KUIDFC procedure of selecting a consultant/agency/research institute/university/NGO. Agreeing on standards for rating the applicants provides a consistent measurement strategy and promotes an objective evaluation of proposals. Once the scoring method is established, the task of reviewing the proposals can begin. Some criteria that may be used to assess the proposals include:

- Evaluation plan and a detailed outline of how to carry it out.
- Successful experience evaluating a similar program;
- Knowledge about evaluation methods;
- Knowledge about the population to be evaluated, including knowledge of the population's culture and first language;
- Ability to submit work in a timely manner;
- Ability to communicate well with the targeted audience, in person and in writing;
- Manpower with requisite capability;
- Financial and institutional strength;
- Prior publication and research outputs;
- Institutional self interest in research and domain knowledge etc.,

b. Several additional questions may help in the final selection:

- Does the evaluator's view of the goals for the evaluation match those of the program to be evaluated?
- Is the evaluator willing to assist in building the knowledge base and skills of program staff?
- Is the evaluator culturally sensitive and able to work with varied target populations?

c. A committee will be set up to review the proposals using the criteria spelled out above. A strong methodological expertise in the review process may help the KEA to weed out inadequate proposals.

d. After all the proposals have been reviewed and rated, KEA will choose the proposal with the highest rating that matches the criteria. There may be a few proposals that are close in rating, and in-person interviews may help the team reach a final choice. If additional information is needed, each applicant may be asked to respond to questions or participate in a "best and final" meeting to ensure that all bidders are given the same opportunities and to ensure an objective scoring. Once an evaluator is chosen, sign a contract defining the scope of work to be completed, deliverables expected, time table, and cost.

e. Evaluation report benchmarking may also will be used to upgrade, down grade rating or black listing of evaluation agencies.

f. The empowered committee chaired by Chief Secretary will finalize and approve the evaluation expenses and outsourcing formalities based on the standard guidelines which will be formulated after constituting the KEA.

g. KTPP Act shall apply to the evaluation outsourcing to the extent that it does not conflict with the quality of evaluation. The Empowered Committee cleared by the Chief Secretary shall decide exceptional cases needing relief and discretion under 4(g) of the KTPP Act.

vi. Evaluation Manual:

The KEA will develop a detailed training manual on evaluation. It may define in detail what is to be evaluated, how it is to be evaluated, when and by whom it is to be evaluated. It will also develop evaluation-monitoring mechanism, guidelines for outsourcing evaluation and evolve procedure to benchmark evaluations. It will also develop responsibility and accountability matrix for evaluation.

vii. Evaluation utilization:

KEA will closely monitor utilization and incorporation of the evaluation findings for fine tuning policies and programmes. A formal procedure to ensure this practice shall be evolved by the Authority.

viii. Evaluation dissemination:

a. Mechanism should be developed for wider dissemination of evaluation findings through making it available on the web. In annual Economic Survey and Annual Report of the Department, invariably a chapter should be on evaluation outcomes a gist of how the (mid-course) revisions (if any) are proposed to be undertaken

b. Evaluation Authority will also provide facility to archive and safe upkeep of TORs, Data collection tools, Evaluation reports etc. for future use. All the departments shall send their TOR, Data Collection tools, Evaluation reports etc to the authority for this purpose.

ix. Evaluation monitoring and tracking:

Proper mechanism may be developed for effective evaluation tracking and monitoring.

III. Evaluation Financing:

a. The Government accords sanction for utilization of Rs. 10.00 crores by KEA as earmarked in the Budget for the year 2011-12 under the Head of account : 2515-00-101-0-26, for discharge of its functions.

The detailed expenditure head are as follows as given in the Head of account No. 2515-00-101-0-26 (Detailed Estimates of Expenditure for the Year 2011-12: major Head 2425-2810—Volume VII-Page No. 42)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Amount (Rs. Lakhs)
1	Salary-Officers	48 70
2	Salary-Staff	19 48
3	Dearness Allowances	36 92
4	Other Allowances	17 05
5	Medical Allowances	1 00
6	Travelling Allowances	10 00
7	Telephone Expenses	1 50

8	Other Expenses	5.00
9	Machinery and Equipments	20.00
10	Transport Expenses	10 00
11	Grant in Aid (Evaluation Studies)	830 45
	Total	1000.00

b The cost of conducting 20 to 30 important detailed external evaluation studies along with a few small exploratory studies is estimated to be around 8.3 crores, which is given in the grant in aid of the budget head In the case of internal evaluation, the line department may earmark 1% of the plan fund for such evaluations In a year all the departments together may take up to 40-60 such evaluations.

c. Also the salary for the officers and administrative staffs can be met from Head of account No 2515-00-101-0-26

IV. Organization Structure of KEA:

a. KEA shall have the sufficient number of well qualified and trained staff capable to conducting, facilitating and/or outsourcing evaluation research.

b The Authority at the state level shall have two units namely I. Programme wing & II. Administrative wing The support staff serving the Authority shall be under the control of Administrative Unit.

c. The employees of the Authority at the State level in each of the two wings and other support staff under the control of Administrative units shall be as follows.

KEA Staffing Pattern.

Sl No.	Category of posts	No of posts	Pay Scale (Rupees)	Salary Per Year (in Rs.)
I	Programme Wing			
1	Chief Evaluation Officer*	1	Scale less post (37400-67000) (AGP 10000)	1400000
2	Additional Chief Evaluation* Officer	1	Scale less post (37400-67000) (AGP 9,000)	1100000
3	Evaluation officers*	4	Scale less post (15600-39000) (AGP-8000)	2400000
4	Web and MIS Manager	1	20025-28725	300000
5	Research Assistants	4	11400-21600	800000
II	Administrative Wing			
6	Administrative Officer	1	20025-28275	289800
7	Accounts Officer	1	14050-25050	234800
8	Office Assistant	1	8000-14800	136800
9	DTP Operator	1	8000-14800	136800
10	Attender	2	4800-7275	150000
11	Driver	2	4800-7275	150000
	Grand Total			7096000

Nota. *These are scale less posts and the scale prescribed are only indicative

d. For appointment of all categories of professional staff as per the qualifications prescribed shall be done by KEA by setting up a screening committee. The Rules and Regulations of screening committee and selection committee will be framed separately

e. For appointment of supporting staff General Body will prescribe eligibility criterion the selection procedure for supporting staff such as MIS and Web Manager, Administration officer, controller of Accounts (Treasurer), Account/Administrative officer/Assistants, DTP operators, Drivers and Group-D Staff.

f Once the above staffing arrangement is made then the posts of present Evaluation Division of the Planning Department will be redeployed in other functional divisions or wherever necessary

g After the Evaluation Authority is registered as a society under the Karnataka Societies Registration Act 1960 and its staff are in place the Evaluation Division of Planning Department will cease to exist.

This order issues with the approval of the Cabinet vide case No C/264/2011, Dated 26.06.2011 as per the provision 16(VI) in the First schedule and within the purview of the sub rule (2) of Rule 17 of the Karnataka Government (Transaction of Business) Rules 1977

By Order and in the name of the Governor of Karnataka
B Chikkaraju
Under Secretary to Government 1 & 2
Planning, Programme Monitoring
and Statistics Department.

P.R. 1778

Annexure-2 (a)

DETAILS OF EXTERNAL EVALUATION STUDIES UNDERTAKEN BY KARNATAKA EVALUATION AUTHORITY (KEA)

Sl. No	Title of study for evaluation and Study cost in Rupees	Name of the Department/Board/Corporation related to the study	Name of Evaluation Agency	Time fixed for evaluation	Whether submission of evaluation
1	Evaluation study of National Rural Health Mission- Rs. 28,80,750.	Health Department	Grassroots Research And Advocacy Movement (GRAAM)	6 months	No
2	Evaluating SAKALA Program- Rs. 27,95,357	DPAR (AR)	Indian Market Research Bureau (IMRB) International, Bangalore	6 months	Yes
3	Rapid Appraisal of Result Framework Document (Cost not known)	Planning	Institute of Social Economic Change (ISEC), Bangalore.	6 months	No
4	Suvarna Gramodaya Scheme- Rs. 5,75,000.	RDPR	Technical Consultancy Services Organization of Karnataka (TECSOK), Bangalore.	6 months	No
5	Suvarna Bhoomi Yojane-Rs. 7,67,278.	Horticulture Department	Catalyst Management Services Pvt Ltd, Bangalore.	6 months	No
6	Madhuvana & Apiculture Scheme- Rs. 4,50,000.	Horticulture Department	Technical Consultancy Services Organization of Karnataka (TECSOK), Bangalore	6 months	No
7	Oil Palm Development Programme in Karnataka-Rs. 5,23,250.	Horticulture Department	Centre for Symbiosis of Technology Environment & Management (STEM), Bangalore	6 months	No
8	Impact Assessment Santwana Scheme- Rs. 4,13,000.	Women & Child Welfare Development	Catalyst Management Services Pvt Ltd, Bangalore.	6 months	No
9	Destitute Cottages-Rs. 4,35,000.	Women & Child Welfare Development	Catalyst Management Services Pvt Ltd, Bangalore.	6 months	No
10	Saving cum relief scheme-Rs. 4,54,500.	Department of Fisheries	Catalyst Management Services Pvt Ltd, Bangalore.	6 months	No
11	Matsya Mahila Swavalambana Scheme- Rs. 5,28,800.	Department of Fisheries	Technical Consultancy Services Organization of Karnataka (TECSOK), Bangalore.	6 months	No
12	Protection of Historical Monuments and Development of Museums taken up under 12th Finance Commission	Directorate of Archaeology and Museums	Rural Ecological & Agro Development Institute (READI) India, Dharwar	6 months	No
13	Karnataka One Integrated Citizen Service Centres in Karnataka-Rs. 3,55,000.	E-Governance Department	Technical Consultancy Services Organization of Karnataka (TECSOK), Bangalore.	6 months	No
14	Evaluation of the process in the Implementation of JnNURM in Karnataka- Rs. 54,65,835.	Karnataka Urban Infrastructure Development & Finance Corporation	National Institute of Advance Studies, Bangalore	6 months	No
15	Secondary and Pre-university Education in Karnataka- Rs. 18,27,000.	Education Department	Forum of Karnataka Retired Education Officers (F-KARE)	6 months	No

CHIEF EVALUATION OFFICER

Chief Evaluation Officer
Karnataka Evaluation Authority
Bangalore-560001

Annexure-3 (b)

Sl. No.	Title of study for evaluation and Study Cost (where known)	Name of the Department/Board/Corporation	Name of the Evaluation Agency	Time fixed for evaluation	Whether submission of evaluation report
1	Status of community Sanitary Complexes built under TSC/NBA- Nirmal Bharth Abhiyan	RDPR	Not known	Not Known	Not Known
2	Sustainability Status of Nirmal Gram Puraskar awarded Gps Under TSC/NBA in the State of Karnataka	RDPR	Not known	Not Known	Not Known
3	Bhoochetana Programme	Agriculture Department	M/s NABARD Consultancy Services Pvt. Ltd (NABCONS)	Time fixed for evaluation . is less than 6 months	No
4	Mysore Paints and Varnish Ltd.,	Department of Public Enterprises	National Productivity Council Bangalore.	Not Known	Not Known
5	Karnataka Vidyuth Karkane (KAVIKA) Limited,Bangalore	Department of Public Enterprises	National Productivity Council Bangalore.	Not Known	Not Known
6	Evaluation of the performance of HESCOM	HESCOM	TECSOK	Not Known	Not Known
7	Evaluation of the performance of KRDCL	Karnataka Road Development Corp. Ltd (KRDCL).	Not known	Not Known	Not Known
8	Evaluation of the lead nongovernmental organizations appointed by the KSBDB for the promotion of bio fuels in the state of Karnataka	Karnataka State Bio Fuel Development Board	Regional Institute of Co-operative Management	Not Known	Not Known
9	Performance of North East Karnataka Road Transport Corporation (NEKRTC)	North East Karnataka Road Transport Corporation	Institute of Public Enterprises, Hyderabad	Not Known	Not Known
10	Performance of North Western Karnataka Road Transport Corporation (NWKRTC)	North Western Karnataka Road Transport Corporation	Institute of Public Enterprises, Hyderabad	Not Known	Not Known

11	Performance of Karnataka State Tourism Development Corporation (KSTDC)	Karnataka State Tourism Development Corporation	Institute of Public Enterprises, Hyderabad	Not Known	Not Known
12	Evaluation of Unit IV Forestry Works of Bangalore Circle-Study Cost Rs. 37,00,000.	Forest Department	Hyderabad Karnataka Centre for Advanced Learning & Welfare Society, Gulbarga	Not Known	Not Known
13	Evaluation of Farm Mechanization Scheme in Karnataka-Study Cost Rs 27,00,000.	Agriculture Department	University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur	6 months	Delayed
14	Evaluation of Weather Based Crop Insurance Study Cost Rs 32,50,000.	Agriculture Department	Karnataka State Natural Disaster Monitoring Centre (KSNDMC), Bangalore	6 months	Delayed
15	Unit-II- Forestry Works (Kanara Circle, Kodagu Circle, Mangalore Circle)-Study Cost Rs. 28,65,000.	Forest Department	Hyderabad Karnataka Centre for Advance Learning(HKCAL), Gulbarga	Not Known	Not Known
16	Evaluation of Unit-I, (Belagum Circle, Dharwad Circle & Gulbarga Circle)-Forestry Works-Study Cost Rs. 29,96,149.	Forest Department	M/s NABARD Consultancy Services Pvt. Ltd (NABCONS)	Not Known	Not Known
17	Evaluation of Unit-III (Shimoga, Bellari, Hasan & Chikkamagalur Circles)-Forestry Works- Study Cost Rs. 29,96,149.	Forest Department	M/s NABARD Consultancy Services Pvt. Ltd (NABCONS)	Not Known	Not Known
18	Nirmala Graama Puraskara	Karnataka Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency (KRWSSA)	Grassroots Research and Advocacy Movement (GRAAM), Mysore	Not Known	Not Known
19	Samadaya Souchalaya	Rajiva Nirumattu Nirmala Mission	M/s Karnataka Center for Advance Learning and Welfare Society (HKCAL)	Not Known	Not Known
20	Performance of Evaluation of Ganga Kalyana	Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Corp. Ltd.	AC Nielson ORG MARG Pvt Ltd, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known

21	Aarogya Bandu	Health and Family Welfare Department	Institute of Health Management Research	Not Known	Not Known
22	Emergency response services (EMRI models) PPP in State of Karnataka	Health and Family Welfare Department	Institute of Health Management Research	Not Known	Not Known
23	Rural Markets Financed under Rural Infrastructure Development Fund in Karnataka	Karnataka State Agriculture Marketing Board	Department of Agriculture Marketing, Co-Operation and Business Management, College of Agriculture, UAS, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Kno
24	Performance of Karnataka Handloom Development Corporation (KHDC)	Department of Public Enterprises	TECSOK, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known
25	Rapid Assessment of Conservation of Monuments-Study Cost Rs. 5,00,000	Department of Archeology, Museum and Heritage	Sri Manjunatheshwara Dharmasthala Trust, Dharmasthala	Not Known	Not Known
26	Evaluation Study of Special Component Programme(SCP) and Tribal Sub Plan(TSP)	Watershed Development Department	Interface India Development Consultants, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known
27	Evaluation of Aids and Appliances Programme	Women and Child Development Department	Interface India Development Consultants, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known
28	Evaluation of Swimming Pools, Indoor Stadia and Halls	Department of Youth Services and Sports	Centre for Population Dynamics, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known

29	Evaluation of Electronic Procurement Project by Government of Karnataka	Centre for e-Governance	Ernst and Young	Not Known	Not Known
30	Evaluation of identified Projects under Total Sanitation Campaign	Karnataka Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency (KRWSSA)	Pragna Research and Consultancy Services, Hyderabad	Not Known	Not Known
31	Concurrent Social Audit and Evaluation of Bridge cum Barrage at Nagaral	Minor Irrigation Department	Sri Maitri Association, Davanagere	Not Known	Not Known
32	Evaluation of Jalakiri Scheme under Special Development Plan	Watershed Development Department	IN-RIMT, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known
33	Evaluation of Purchase of Books in KIMS Library, Hubli	KIMS, Hubli	TECSOK, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known
34	Evaluation of National Biogas and Manure Management Programme	RDPR Department	TERI, Delhi	Not Known	Not Known
35	Evaluation on the Impact of Implementation of Western Ghats Development Programme in Karnataka	RDPR Department	ISEC, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known
36	Evaluation of Micro Irrigation Scheme in Karnataka	Depart of Horticulture	IN-RIMT, Bangalore	Not Known	Not Known

* Since in case of Internal Evaluation, Selection of Evaluation Agency and cost of study is fixed by the concerned department, the study cost and time period of evaluation is not generally known to Karnataka Evaluation Authority

Chief Evaluation Officer
Karnataka Evaluation Authority
Bangalore-560001